



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

praised. The discussion of decision and *dictum* hardly adds to the classic discussion by Professor Wambaugh. So far as one can see, the author comes to his material without prior first-hand knowledge of the problem. In the paragraph headed "Judicial decisions as law or evidence of law" he treats a question over which legal thinkers have been in dispute for generations as if a single reference to Austin and a sentence from Pollock were enough to dispose of the matter. In dealing with precedents in English law the author relies on Markby's somewhat crude opinion that the decisions of the earlier judges were used "as indicating the custom of England, and not as authority"; though Sir Frederick Pollock has long since vouched very early authority to prove the force of precedent in the fourteenth century. In dealing with precedents in the modern civil law he relies on a passage from Dillon, who is hardly a primary authority on the point. It is of course currently said that precedents are of no authority and never cited in court in countries governed by the civil law of Europe. But the reports of decisions in countries governed by the civil law during the last century are probably greater in number than those of England and America combined; and as to Mexico, which he says "has no regular reports or records of adjudged cases," one American library alone contains one hundred and sixty-eight volumes of such reports, and is far from complete. Spain, from which the Mexican law is derived, so far from giving no force to precedents, gives far more than we do; for every decision which stands at all receives an official sanction which gives it the force of statute.

These criticisms, however, are all directed at a comparatively unimportant part of the work. It may be said in general that the treatise covers an important portion of the law not hitherto covered by any treatise, and does it well.

J. H. B.

A SUMMARY OF THE LAW OF TORTS. By John W. Salmond. Being An Abridgment for the Use of Students of the Same Author's Treatise on the Law of Torts. London: Stevens and Haynes. 1912. pp. xxii, 320.

THE LAW OF TORTS. By John W. Salmond. Third Edition. London: Stevens and Haynes. 1912. pp. xxx, 548.

If a type of legal literature is to be developed for the relief of students seeking "to take an examination in a book without reading it," the reader's interest not less than the author's indicates the latter as the maker of his own abridgment. But American students with a less contracted aim will gain nothing by Mr. Salmond's "Summary," for neatly and skilfully as the work of compression is done it is all pure loss. The larger book is none too large. Indeed Mr. Salmond has adhered so strictly to his declared purpose of making it a "compendium of legal principles" that its statements sometimes tend to bareness, and the reader finds himself wishing for the fuller expression of views which he has good reason to know would be both valuable and interesting.

A new edition of the larger treatise, coming less than two years after the second, is added evidence of its deserved popularity. It has lately been made the accredited text-book in the subject for the LL.B. examination in Cambridge, and the esteem in which it is held on this side of the Atlantic is indicated by the award of the Ames Prize to Mr. Salmond in 1910.

In the third edition, as in the second, the changes from the earlier edition (noticed in 22 HARV. L. REV. 69) have not been great, but the work of revision has evidently been done with care, and there are some interesting additions. The author recants his former opinion that a corporation is not liable for a tort committed in an ultra vires undertaking and accepts the American cases sustaining the liability. The need of a broader treatment of Negligence still makes itself felt. On this subject Mr. Salmond's book does not mark an advance over Sir Frederick Pollock's.

E. R. T.